

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated January 16, 2007, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration based on the attached amendment and the following remarks. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as presented here are in condition for allowance.

Claims 1-23 are pending in the present application. The Examiner has indicated that claims 2, 4-8, 12 and 14-18 are allowable, although the Examiner also states that claims 2, 4, 6, 7, 12, 14, 16 and 17 are objected to for informalities. Applicants cordially thank the Examiner for indication of the allowable subject matter. Claims 2, 4, 6, 7, 10, 14, 17 and 19-22 have been amended. No new matter has been added by the amendment. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of claims 1-23 based on the amendment and the following remarks.

Claim Objections

Claims 2, 4, 6, 7, 10, 12, 14, 16, 17 and 21 stand objected to for informalities. The Examiner states that claims 2, 6, 7, 10, 14, 16 and 17 stand objected to because the phrase "currents that flow each of the lamps..." is not grammatically correct and should be rewritten. The Examiner suggests the use of the phrase "currents that flow in each" or "currents that flow towards each". The Examiner states that the fifth and sixth transistors of Claims 4 and 14, while understandable, may be confusing because there are no first-fourth transistors named within the claim language. The Examiner suggests rewriting the claim to include first and second transistors rather than fifth and sixth transistors. The Examiner states that listing of lamp types in claim 21 is unclear and should be rewritten.

Claims 2, 4, 6, 7, 10, 12, 14, 16, 17 and 21 have been amended as suggested by the Examiner.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the objection to claims 2, 4, 6, 7, 10, 12, 14, 16, 17 and 21 for informalities be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 19 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The Examiner states that the term "receiving

holes” of claim 19 is not used within the disclosure of the current application. The Examiner further states that claim 20 inherits the unclear language from claim 19 from which it depends.

Claims 19 and 20 have been amended to delete any reference to a “receiving hole”.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection to claims 2, 4, 6, 7, 10, 12, 14, 16, 17 and 21 under § 112, first paragraph, be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1, 3, 9, 10, 11, 13, 21, 22 and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Lin (U.S. Patent No. 6,259,615, hereinafter “Lin”) in view of Nalbant (U.S. Patent No. 5,615,093, hereinafter “Nalbant”). The Examiner further states that Lin discloses all of the elements of the abovementioned claims except, *providing multiple lamps in parallel*, which the Examiner further states is disclosed primarily in FIGS. 5 and 9 of Nalbant. Applicants respectfully traverse for at least the reason set forth below.

First, with respect to claims 22 and 23, independent claim 22 has been amended to recite, *inter alia*, wherein the feedback detection part sums the currents that flow in each of the lamps to form a summed current, which the Examiner has indicated to define over the prior art of record as discussed on page 7 of the Detailed Action. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 22, including claims depending therefrom, i.e., claim 23, define over Lin and Nalbant, either alone or in combination.

Second, with respect to claims 1, 3, 9, 10, 11, 13 and 21, it is respectfully submitted that neither Lin nor Nalbant, either alone or in combination, disclose, teach or suggest “a feedback detection part, the feedback detection part receiving current that flows via the lamps to provide the power supplying part with a feedback signal that prevents the power supplying part from providing normal lamps with power, when at least one of the lamps is abnormal,” as recited in independent claims 1 and 11.

Lin discloses a lamp driving device driving only one lamp, which prevents the one lamp from being operated when the one lamp is abnormal, and Nalbant discloses lamps connected in parallel with each other.

However, Lin and Nalbant do not disclose, teach or suggest the feedback detection part for preventing the power supplying part from providing normal lamps with power, when at least one of the lamps is abnormal. Even when some of the lamps are abnormal, a conventional lamp driving device (e.g., as in Lin and Nalbant) drives the remaining normal lamps. Some users may

prefer the conventional lamp driving device, because the normal lamps can still emit light. However, lifetimes of the remaining normal lamps using the conventional lamp driving device are reduced because currents for the abnormal lamps flow through the remaining normal lamps.

In contrast, according to the present invention, when only one of the lamps is abnormal, all lamps are forced to stop operating. More specifically, neither Lin nor Nalbant, either alone or in combination, disclose, teach or suggest that the feedback detection part receiving current that flows via the lamps to provide the power supplying part with a feedback signal that prevents the power supplying part from providing normal lamps with power, when at least one of the lamps is abnormal, as recited in independent claims 1 and 11. Thus claims 1 and 11, including claims depending therefrom, i.e., claims 2-10 and 12-21, define over Lin in view of Nalbant.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection to claims 1, 3, 9, 10, 11, 13, 21, 22 and 23 under § 103(a) be withdrawn and allow the same to issue.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks distinguishing the prior art of record, Applicants submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Early notification to this effect is requested. The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' Attorneys at the below-listed telephone number regarding this Amendment or otherwise regarding the present application in order to address any questions or remaining issues concerning the same. If there are any charges due in connection with this response, please charge them to Deposit Account 06-1130.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

By: /James J. Merrick/
James J. Merrick
Registration No. 43,801
Confirmation No. 4082
Cantor Colburn LLP
55 Griffin Road South
Bloomfield, CT 06002
Telephone (860) 286-2929
Customer No. 23413

Date: April 16, 2007